UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1999/151
12 February 1999

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 11 FEBRUARY 1999 FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE EXERCISE OF THE INALIENABLE RIGHTS OF THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

In my capacity as Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, I have the honour to refer to the summary statement by the Secretary-General on matters of which the Security Council is seized and on the stage reached in their consideration (S/1999/25).

I should like to reiterate the Committee's objection to the deletion from the list of items related to the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, the Palestine question and the Middle East problem, which are of utmost concern not only to the Committee but also to the majority of Member States. The Committee believes that pending a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict in the Middle East, the core of which is the question of Palestine, in accordance with international legitimacy, these items should remain on the list of matters of which the Council is seized, as they continue to engage its responsibility with regard to the maintenance of international peace and security.

I should also like to stress our view that any decision to delete these items, in the absence of positive developments in the peace process, would go well beyond procedural reform and would have far-reaching negative political implications. On behalf of the Committee, I would like once again to express firm hope that decisions of such fundamental importance will be taken in thorough consultation with all the parties concerned.

I should be grateful if you would have the text of the present letter circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Ibra Deguène KA
Chairman
Committee on the Exercise of
the Inalienable Rights of the
Palestinian People

99-03848 (E) 160299

UNITED NATIONS **S**

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1999/152
16 February 1999

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 12 FEBRUARY 1999 FROM THE CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES A.I. OF THE PERMANENT MISSION OF YUGOSLAVIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I am writing pursuant to the letter dated 5 February 1999 from the Permanent Representatives of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Slovenia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council, circulated as a document of the Council (S/1999/120), questioning the status of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in the United Nations.

In that connection, I recall that the present status of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is determined by the decision of the General Assembly of the United nations, contained in its resolution 47/1, in which the Assembly decided that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia should not participate in the work of the Assembly. The legal aspect of this decision was summed up in the letter of the Under-Secretary-General for Legal Affairs, the Legal Counsel, of 29 September 1992, circulated as a document of the Assembly (A/47/485, annex), in which the Under-Secretary-General expressed the considered view of the Secretariat of the United Nations that Assembly resolution 47/1 neither terminated nor suspended Yugoslavia's membership in the Organization.

The letter also stated that "General Assembly resolution 47/1 deals with a membership issue which is not foreseen in the Charter of the United Nations, namely, the consequences for purposes of membership in the United Nations of the disintegration of a Member State on which there is no agreement among the immediate successors of that State or among the membership of the Organization at large. This explains the fact that resolution 47/1 was not adopted pursuant to Article 5 (suspension) of the Charter nor under Article 6 (expulsion). The resolution makes no reference either to those Articles or to the criteria contained in those Articles".

Furthermore, the Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to the United Nations in New York and that to the United Nations Office at Geneva continue to function and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia pays its contribution to the regular budget of the United Nations, while in its communications, the United Nations Secretariat treats the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia as a regular State Member of the United Nations.

I would be very grateful if you would have the present letter circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Vladislav JOVANOVIĆ
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

UNITED NATIONS **S**

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1999/153
16 February 1999
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: ARABIC

LETTER DATED 13 FEBRUARY 1999 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF IRAQ TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a letter dated 12 February 1999 from Mr. Tariq Aziz, Deputy Prime Minister and Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq. The Minister calls attention to the fact that the United States and the United Kingdom are continuing to implement their policy of aggression against Iraq, which constitutes a dangerous precedent in international relations and a breach of the norms and covenants governing such relations, and he urges you to request the Security Council to bring an end to unlawful actions that undermine the Council's role in the maintenance of international peace and security.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Saeed H. HASAN
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

Annex

Letter dated 12 February 1999 from the Deputy Prime Minister and Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq addressed to the Secretary-General

I wish to inform you that the United States and the United Kingdom are still intent on implementing their policy of brutal aggression against the people, Government, national sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq. This policy has been embodied in the series of operations and blatant acts of aggression in which they engage on a daily basis in a manner that poses a grave threat not only to Iraq but to peace and security in the region and in the world as a whole, thereby subverting every norm of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations.

United States and British aircraft have continued their stepped-up violations of Iraq's airspace in the north and south of the country from the military bases established in Saudi, Kuwaiti and Turkish territory for the purpose of enforcing the no-flight zones whose imposition is intrinsically a measure extraneous to the law and one that has no international legitimacy. As you well know and as the whole world is aware, it was the United States and British Administrations that proceeded to impose these zones in accordance with the dictates of their own interests and the achievement of their own objectives in Iraq and in the region. These are objectives that bear no relation to the resolutions of the Security Council or to the principles of international law.

Day after day, events prove the existence of this policy of aggression against Iraq. There are the continuing intensive strikes being carried out by United States and British aircraft against numerous Iraqi civilian localities, including cities, residential neighbourhoods and populated areas, and the most recent of these has been the strike against residential neighbourhoods in the city of Basrah on the morning of 25 January 1999. In its issue for 31 January 1999, The Washington Post published an article containing the following statement concerning these strikes:

> "It's a way of pursuing an objective in a way that everyone's comfortable with", said a senior Administration official involved in the decision-making. "You get things done without rocking any boats. If we started a broad bombing campaign people would say, 'What provoked this?'"

It appears from this statement that, having seen the whole world's condemnation of the assault it launched against Iraqi territory in which it failed to achieve its main objective of changing the national regime in Iraq, the United States then began planning to engage in military operations of a different type involving low-intensity, high-technology strikes to enable it, in the long term, to achieve its objectives without arousing inter-Arab and international public opinion against it.

This policy has also been proclaimed by the Acting Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations, Ambassador A. Peter Burleigh, who stated in an interview with the newspaper Al-Hayat on 5 February 1999 that

United States policy was to replace the regime in the long term. He also said that they would persist in maintaining the no-flight zones, and that if others in the Security Council found that that was unacceptable to them or that they did not like it, then that was their opinion and their decision.

The statement of the United States ambassador clearly shows the contempt in which the United States Administration holds the will of the international community and, in particular, the other States members of the Security Council that reject this policy as being incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations and with the function it assigns to the Council.

Silence on the part of the United Nations in the face of these actions by the United States and the United Kingdom would have dangerous repercussions for international peace and security, in that it would represent the beginning of the collapse of the collective security system enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. It would also constitute a dangerous precedent in international relations and would violate the norms and covenants that govern such relations, chief among them the peremptory norm of international law requiring non-interference in the internal affairs of States. This norm is affirmed in Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter of the United Nations, and it does not allow even the United Nations itself to interfere in affairs that pertain to the core of the internal authority of States.

As it calls your attention to the dangerous phenomenon created by the actions of a permanent member of the Security Council in full view of the entire world, the Government of Iraq expresses the hope that you will take the initiative of urging the Security Council to meet all the responsibilities assigned to it under the Charter of the United Nations and to bring an end to the unlawful actions of the United States and the United Kingdom that are undermining its role in the maintenance of international peace and security.

The Government of Iraq reserves in full its right under international law to protect the safety of its people, its airspace and its territorial integrity and to seek full compensation for all the human, material and other losses sustained by the people of Iraq both from the aggressor countries and from those countries such as Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Turkey that facilitate the aggression and participate in it by making their air bases available for use by attacking aircraft.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Tariq AZIZ
Deputy Prime Minister
Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs

UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1999/154
16 February 1999

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 16 FEBRUARY 1999 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF ETHIOPIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I have the honour to transmit to you a press statement, issued on 15 February 1999 by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ethiopia, in connection with Security Council resolution 1227 (1999) of 10 February 1999 (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Duri MOHAMMED
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

99-04015 (E) 160299

/...

Annex

Press release dated 15 February 1999 by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ethiopia

Ethiopia's response to the latest Security Council resolution

When the United Nations Security Council adopted resolution 1227 (1999), on 10 February 1999, on the crisis between Ethiopia and Eritrea, history appeared to have repeated itself. The people of Ethiopia, who have maintained their independence for thousands of years, on their own and against all odds, had once again the misfortune of placing full confidence in collective security. The frustration and the disappointment they faced in this regard is highlighted by the infamy the League of Nations is remembered for. The imposition of an arms embargo by the League of Nations on Italy, the colonial aggressor, and on Ethiopia, the victim of colonial aggression, is still fresh in the memories of the Ethiopian people. The League of Nations felt the steps were necessary for peace, and because equity demanded that the League be evenhanded. This looks farcical now because subsequent events have made most able to see the injustice behind the decision and the double standard for which the League of Nations is remembered. But double standards hardly seem to have died with the League of Nations. It is Ethiopia's fate again, as a victim, to be treated in the same way as the aggressor.

This is the most unique feature of Security Council resolution 1227 (1999) on the crisis between Ethiopia and Eritrea. The double standard is well reflected, inter alia, in paragraph 7 of the resolution, which strongly urges all States to end immediately all sales of arms and munition to Ethiopia and Eritrea. On the surface, this sounds fair and appropriate. But this is patently misleading.

All third parties, without exception, that have at one time or another been seized with the crisis have realized that aggression was committed by Eritrea against Ethiopia. This realization has been the basis for the United States-Rwandese peace plan and for the Organization of African Unity (OAU) Framework Agreement. Nor is it lost on the Security Council that Ethiopia has been a victim of aggression. Its endorsement of the OAU Framework Agreement, whose core demands are the withdrawal of Eritrean troops from forcibly occupied Ethiopian territory and the return of the status quo ante, rests on the realization that Eritrea is the aggressor.

A country whose territory has been occupied, and which therefore has all the legitimate right of self-defense under the Charter of the United Nations and under international law, is being told it has no right to defend itself against invasion by a country that has not only committed aggression but has also refused to accept all peace proposals that have been made so far.

Ethiopia has accepted all peace proposals made so far, including the United States-Rwandese proposal and that of OAU. Ethiopia has also extended full cooperation to all third parties that have made their good offices available,

while Eritrea, apart from rejecting all peace proposals, has also been engaged in a smear campaign against virtually all those involved in peace-making.

The Security Council knows where the truth lies and what the obstacles are to peace. There can be no confusion on this. In a presidential statement of 13 November 1998, the Council appeared to throw its weight behind the OAU peace proposal when it endorsed the Framework Agreement as fair and balanced.

In resolution 1226 (1999) adopted on 29 January 1999, the Council, expressing its strong support for the Framework Agreement, affirmed that the Agreement provided the best hope for peace between the two parties and called for its implementation without delay. Aware that it was Eritrea which has been the obstacle to peace and to the implementation of the OAU Framework Agreement, the same Council resolution, welcoming Ethiopia's acceptance of the OAU brokered peace plan, strongly urged Eritrea to accept the Framework Agreement as the basis for a peaceful resolution of the border dispute between Ethiopia and Eritrea without delay.

That the Security Council should turn around suddenly and adopt resolution 1227 (1999) with provisions which signal denial to the victim of aggression of its rights of self-defence provided for under the Charter of the United Nations and sanctioned by international law, is as puzzling as it is unfair. On the other hand, the same resolution obviously would have the effect of encouraging the aggressor to persist in its intransigence and to continue even more to frustrate the OAU's effort.

When Eritrea faced a growing international pressure calling on it to accept the OAU peace plan and found itself pinned down, it responded to this by a new and large-scale offensive on 6 February 1999, with the calculated objective of creating a generalized sense of escalating crisis with the hope of undermining and scuttling the OAU peace plan. Security Council resolution 1227 (1999) is a reward for this dangerous Eritrean gamble. It took no account of how much the people of Ethiopia would be wounded and hurt by it.

Ethiopia remains, as always, committed to peace. Even at this juncture, when prospects for a peaceful resolution have dimmed, it remains committed to the OAU Framework Agreement, which awaits implementation. This is a peace proposal which has been crafted by African Heads of State with a great deal of effort. It cannot be tampered with, and any attempt to do so would indeed be a disservice to peace and another thinly disguised step to reward aggression. Ethiopia would not accept this, as it would not accept demands that it relinquish rights that it has as a sovereign State, most particularly in this instance its rights of self-defence. Ethiopia has always been flexible in the quest for peace. It would be a gross misunderstanding, however, to mistake this for a lack of resolve to protect the rights and dignity of the Ethiopian people.

UNITED NATIONS **S**

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1999/155
16 February 1999

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

REPORT BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL CONCERNING THE CREDENTIALS OF THE ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF MALAYSIA ON THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Pursuant to rule 15 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, the Secretary-General wishes to report that he has received a letter dated 12 February 1999 from the Permanent Representative of Malaysia to the United Nations stating that Roslan Abdul Rahman has been appointed alternate representative of Malaysia on the Security Council.

In the opinion of the Secretary-General, that communication constitutes adequate provisional credentials.

99-04007 (E) 160299

UNITED
NATIONS

A S

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/53/830
S/1999/156
16 February 1999
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Fifty-third session
Agenda item 43
THE SITUATION OF DEMOCRACY AND
HUMAN RIGHTS IN HAITI

SECURITY COUNCIL
Fifty-third year

Letter dated 11 February 1999 from the Permanent Representative of Haiti to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit to you herewith the text issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Haiti entitled "Position of the Haitian Government on the expiration of the mandate of the forty-sixth Legislature".

I should be grateful if you would arrange for the text of this letter and its annex to be distributed as a document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Pierre LELONG

99-04069 (E) 190299 220299

/...

Annex

POSITION OF THE HAITIAN GOVERNMENT ON THE EXPIRATION OF THE MANDATE OF THE FORTY-SIXTH LEGISLATURE

(Port-au-Prince, 26 January 1999)

More than 18 months ago, the resignation of the Prime Minister Rosny Smarth, following the disputed results of the elections of 6 April 1997, triggered a political crisis. This crisis was exacerbated when he refused to continue in a caretaker capacity and effectively abandoned his post in violation of article 165 of the Constitution which stipulates that: "In the event of the Prime Minister's resignation, the Government shall remain in place until the appointment of a successor, in order to transact current business".

Conscious of the fact that the political crisis resulted from the controversy surrounding the elections, President Préval has always maintained that that issue must be resolved as a first step towards any solution. In that context, for example, between 17 April and 28 October 1997, he held 25 meetings with representatives of the Organisation du Peuple en Lutte (OPL), the political party holding a relative majority in Parliament. He also met with, inter alia, representatives of Fanmi Lavalas, the Mouvement Ouvrier Paysan (MOP) and institutions of civil society, including workers' and employers' organizations and religious associations of every denomination.

These meetings were about to produce concrete results when the OPL representatives withdrew their support for the solution which had been negotiated. Consequently, the Presidential Committee which was to evaluate the elections of 6 April 1997 has been unable to function as intended.

The crisis reached its peak with the expiration of the mandate of the forty-sixth Legislature on the second Monday in January 1999, in conformity with article 158 of the Electoral Law of 14 February 1995 which provides that: "The terms of the Second Senators, Deputies, Mayors and Members of the various Conseils d'administration de section communale (CASEC) elected during the elections of 1995 shall expire on the second Monday in January 1999, irrespective of the date on which they were sworn in."

This provision gives effect to articles 92 and 92-1 of the Constitution, which stipulate:

Article 92: Deputies shall be elected for four (4) years and may be reelected an indefinite number of times.

Article 92-1: They shall take office on the second Monday in January, and shall sit in two (2) annual sessions. The duration of their term shall comprise a legislative session.

Because of the political context in the wake of the coup d'état of September 1991, no elections could be held in 1994. The mandate of the forty-fifth Legislature having expired on the second Monday in January 1995, this

resulted in a temporary institutional vacuum because the forty-sixth Legislature was not sworn in until 18 October 1995, instead of on the second Monday in January as stipulated by the Constitution. Given this exceptional situation, which is comparable to the present one in January 1995, the Senate of the Republic adopted a resolution amending its procedures. According to article 1 of that resolution, until such time as the forty-sixth Legislature takes office, the quorum of the Senate authorized to hold meetings with a view to taking decisions within the scope of its constitutional prerogatives shall be six senators.

It must be emphasized that the Electoral Law gives effect to the provisions of the Constitution; articles 90-1, 130, 130-1 and 130-2 of the Constitution stipulate that:

Article 90-1: Deputies shall be elected by an absolute majority of votes cast in the Primary Assemblies, according to the conditions and in the manner prescribed by the Electoral Law.

Article 130: In the event of the death, resignation, disqualification or judicial interdiction of a Deputy or Senator, or acceptance by him of a duty incompatible with that of a member of the Legislature, a by-election shall be called by the Primary Electoral Assembly, to be conducted by the Permanent Electoral Council in the month the vacancy occurs, to elect a replacement in the Electoral District in question for only the remainder of the unexpired term.

Article 130-1: The election shall take place within thirty (30) days after convocation of the Primary Assembly, pursuant to the Constitution.

Article 130-2: The same procedure shall apply in the absence of an election or in the event that the elections in one or more Electoral Districts are declared null and void by the Permanent Electoral Council.

It is clear, in the light of these articles, that the absence of elections in 1994 resulted in a forty-sixth Legislature with a mandate valid only for the remainder of the unexpired term.

Despite the requirements of the Constitution and the Electoral Law, Members of Parliament adopted a resolution extending the term of the Second Senators and Deputies until the second Monday in September 1999, claiming that by so doing they would be avoiding what they described as an institutional vacuum, although they acknowledged, at the time they took office, that their terms would expire on the second Monday in January 1999. This point is made quite clearly on pages 74, 76, 77, 78, 82, 84 and 85 of the official register published by the Parliament in 1996, entitled "The Forty-Sixth Legislative Session of the Haitian Parliament".

On Monday, 11 January 1999, President René Préval stated in a message to the nation that he was not constitutionally empowered to extend or reduce the terms of the Members of Parliament and that he could do no more than note the expiration of the constitutional terms of the Second Senators and Deputies elected under the Electoral Law of February 1995. In conclusion, the President of the Republic has not on any account dissolved the Parliament; it is still

sitting with nine (9) Senators whose terms will expire in 2001. Nor has there been, a fortiori, any sudden or untimely interruption of the democratic, institutional political process. The Head of State has not invested himself with dictatorial powers, nor has he announced any decision to govern by decree, as is being claimed, out of ignorance, lack of information or excessive partisanship, based on resolution 1080 of the Organization of American States (OAS).

As guarantor of the smooth functioning of institutions in accordance with the prescripts of the Constitution, he has initiated consultations with all sectors of society in order to resolve the problem of the dysfunction of the parliamentary institution. According to the President, the only way to do this is by holding fair and credible elections at the earliest opportunity. Accordingly, he has called on all the political forces to enter into a dialogue with a view to establishing a consensus-based Provisional Electoral Council. It is clear that he sees the strengthening of democracy as the means of resolving the current institutional crisis.

UNITED NATIONS **S**

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1999/157
16 February 1999

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 16 FEBRUARY 1999 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF ERITREA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I have been instructed to forward to you the attached statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the State of Eritrea entitled "Ethiopia's rejection of an arms embargo" issued today, 16 February 1999 (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would kindly circulate the text of the present letter and its annex as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Haile MENKERIOS
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

99-04021 (E) 160299

/...

Annex

Statement by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Eritrea
issued on 16 February 1999 in Asmara

In its official statement yesterday (15 February 1999), Ethiopia accused the United Nations Security Council of having "double standards" and of "rewarding Eritrea's dangerous gamble". The reason that has apparently aroused the regime's irrational fury is paragraph 7 of Security Council resolution 1227 (1999) of 10 February 1999, which strongly urges all States to end immediately all sales of arms and munitions to Ethiopia and Eritrea.

As it may be recalled, the Government of Eritrea has argued strongly that an isolated arms embargo on Ethiopia and Eritrea - desirable as this might be in the context of the current conflict - will only lead to a dangerous imbalance if it is not applied simultaneously to States in the area whose agenda of regional destabilization is well-known.

But Ethiopia's protest does not emanate from such cogent considerations. Leaving aside the abusive language with which the Ethiopian regime has couched its case, why is Addis Ababa so averse to balanced arms control?

The Ethiopian regime opposes an arms embargo because it has an insatiable desire to occupy Eritrean territory by force. To achieve this, it believes that it must purchase weapons which will give it superiority. It has spent around 400 million dollars in a weapons shopping spree in the past eight months. But it wants more, even as it is soliciting food aid to the tune of 100 million dollars from the World Food Programme.

While this is the transparent motive of its protest, Ethiopia has tried to invoke international law to argue that the embargo should be targeted at Eritrea alone. Indeed, it has the audacity to claim that the United Nations is repeating history by condemning aggressor and victim alike as did the League of Nations when Italy invaded Ethiopia in 1935.

If there is one nation that deserves redress for a historical injustice meted to it at the hand of the United Nations, it is Eritrea. The United Nations imposed a federation between Eritrea and Ethiopia in 1952, against the expressed wishes of the Eritrean people. Ethiopia unilaterally abrogated this international instrument to annex Eritrea in 1962. And, Eritrea had to struggle for 30 years to regain its national independence, paying precious sacrifices in the process, while its was ignored by the world body.

But this is history and Eritrea has forgotten and forgiven the historical injustice that it suffered. The energies of the Eritrean Government are accordingly focused on resolving the current crisis with Ethiopia.

What are the origins of this crisis? What has been Ethiopia's record?

Ferocious confrontations - much bigger in scale and intensity than the clashes that occurred in May and June last year - have taken place last week on

the Mereb-Setit and Alitiena-Mereb fronts. Ethiopia has further unleashed attacks on the Burie front on 14 and 15 February, an act that is raising serious questions of its motive, as Addis Ababa does not have territorial claims on this part of Eritrea. In any case, the international community is well aware of the bombing of Adigrat that Ethiopia fabricated - rather ineptly - to prepare a pretext to break the moratorium on air strikes and to justify the large-scale offensive that it launched on 6 February 1999 and has been continuing since. Hence, it has become obvious to the international community, although belatedly, that Ethiopia's first and only option is war. The aggressor country is Ethiopia, which is not only bent on regaining contested territory by force, but also appears to entertain other sinister designs on its neighbour.

In regard to the earlier incidents too, the aggressor was Ethiopia as the following facts illustrate:

Ethiopia used force to occupy the Eritrean village of Adi Murug in Bada in August 1997 and to dismantle the administration there;

Ethiopia violated the international boundary between the two countries by publishing, in October 1997, a new official map incorporating large chunks of Eritrean territory into the Administrative Zone of Tigray;

Ethiopia escalated its encroachments on Eritrean territory in the Badme area, evicting Eritreans from their land and destroying their property;

Ethiopia carried out an unprovoked attack against a small unit of the Eritrean army within Eritrean territory on 6 May 1998, killing four officers and wounding three others. This led to a series of clashes until 12 May 1998.

These are wanton acts of aggression as defined by the relevant articles of the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, as well as the relevant resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly. This is also the reason why Ethiopia has been adamantly resisting a comprehensive investigation of all the events that led to the current crisis.

Ethiopia falsely claims that all third parties without exception that have at one time or another been seized with the crisis have realized that aggression was committed by Eritrea against Ethiopia. If the facilitators had asked Eritrea to withdraw from Badme, it was because they felt that a face-saving formula was vital for the Ethiopian regime which had ineptly cornered itself into a box. Otherwise they were categorical in stating in the document that they were not being judgemental about the origin of the crisis. If the Organization of African Unity has repeated that plea in some varied form, the reason has again been the same. They asked Eritrea to show goodwill because Ethiopia had strenuously claimed that it had been humiliated.

Eritrea has not accepted these arguments because, in reality, it is Eritrea which has been humiliated by Ethiopia through repetitive acts of aggression as well as the perpetration of gross violations of human rights on its citizens who were resident in Ethiopia.

In conclusion, Ethiopia can certainly oppose the call for an arms embargo, but it must honestly tell us the real reason, which is the furtherance of its aggression.